

Appln. No.: 09/740,364  
Amendment Dated April 25, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of February 23, 2005

MATP-600US

**Remarks/Arguments:****Claim Status**

Claims 1-19 are pending and stand rejected.

By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 11, 14 and 17-19 are amended, new claim 20 is added, and claim 2 is canceled without prejudice.

Applicant contends that no new matter has been added by the claim amendments and new claims and accordingly, entry and approval of same is respectfully requested. Support for the claim amendments and new claim is found throughout the specification, and, more particularly, in the specification at page 11, lines 7-9 and the disclosure related to FIG. 4.

**Entry Of Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116**

Applicant requests entry of this Rule 116 Amendment because this Amendment place the application in condition for allowance.

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures sets forth in Section 714.12 that "any amendment that would place the case either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal may be entered." Moreover, Section 714.13 sets forth that "the Proposed Amendment should be given sufficient consideration to determine whether the claims are in condition for allowance and/or whether the issues on appeal are simplified." The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures further articulates that the reason for any non-entry should be explained expressly in the Advisory Action.

**Objections to the Specification**

In the Action at item 1, the specification was objected to because of the introduction of new matter.

The specification has been amended to remove the subject matter identified by the Examiner as new matter. The Examiner is thanked for his assistance in pointing out this issue.

It is submitted that this objection is now overcome.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Page 9 of 13

Appln. No.: 09/740,364  
Amendment Dated April 25, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of February 23, 2005

MATP-600US

In the Action at item 3, the specification was objected to for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter "channel group selector."

The term "channel group selector" has been amended in the claims to "channel group indicator" to better improve antecedent support therefor, (for example, see element 22A in the specification.)

It is submitted that this objection is now overcome.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**Rejection of Claims 1-7, 11-17 and 19 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In the Action at item 7, claims 1-7, 11-17 and 19 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Agasse (WO 2000/05887) in view of Harms et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,057,831), and further in view of Bedard (U.S. Patent No. 5,805,235).

**Claim 1**

Claim 1 is directed to a display interface for a television receiver, and recites "wherein respective channel indicators on said channel matrix are highlighted to indicate that corresponding channels are bookmarked; and removal means for simultaneously removing bookmarks corresponding to highlighted channel indicators on said channel matrix."

**Agasse Reference**

Agasse describes that favorite channels may be assigned and various display options for these assigned favorite channels. (See Agasse at page 32, lines 6-25.) Agasse teaches that "programs (sic) and/or channels may be grouped according to a user's selection, for example, of favourite channels, and the cursor attribute changed accordingly whenever it is positioned over a window displaying one of the user's favourite channels" to ease user identification of certain channels and programs displayed in the mosaic formation. (See Agasse at page 6, lines 2-7.) Thus, Agasse does not disclose or suggest simultaneous removal of bookmarks because an action (i.e., a change to a channel attribute) can only occur when the cursor is positioned over a window displaying that channel.

Appln. No.: 09/740,364  
Amendment Dated April 25, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of February 23, 2005

MATP-600US

**Harms et al. Reference**

Harms et al. describes a TV graphical interface, but is silent regarding anything related to bookmarks and, furthermore, to simultaneous removal of bookmarks.

**Bedard Reference**

Bedard describes bookmarking of television programs and channels. In the Bedard system, bookmarks are assigned and removed as a toggle, for example, by moving an icon cursor 42 on the icon bar 40 over a Mark/Unmark icon 54 while a particular program is viewed. Thus, Bedard does not disclose or suggest simultaneous removal of bookmarks because toggling of a bookmark is done while that channel (i.e., only a single channel) is being viewed.

The cited art of Agasse, Harms et al. and Bedard taken singularly or in any proper combination do not disclose or suggest the limitations of claim 1, and accordingly, claim 1 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Agasse, Harms et al. and Bedard.

Claims 11, 17 and 19 include recitation similar to those of claim 1 and are submitted to be patentable for as least similar reasons as those of claim 1.

Claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice and the subject matter incorporated into claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 2 is now moot.

Claims 3-7 and 12-16 include all the limitations of their respective independent claim and, accordingly, also are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Agasse, Harms et al. and Bedard.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**Rejection of Claims 8-10 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In the Action at item 8, claims 8-10 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Agasse in view of Harms et al. and Bedard, and further in view of Handelsmann (U.S. Patent No. 6,654,721).

Claims 8-10 are submitted to be patentable over the cited art of Agasse in view of Harms et al. and Bedard for the same reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Appln. No.: 09/740,364  
Amendment Dated April 25, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of February 23, 2005

MATP-600US

It is submitted that the additional reference of Handelsmann does not overcome the deficiencies of Agasse in view of Harms et al. and Bedard because Handelsmann does not disclose or suggest the feature of simultaneous removal of bookmarks as recited in claim 1. This is because, in particular, Handelsmann is directed to voice activation communication for program guides and is silent about the feature of simultaneous removal of bookmarks.

Claims 8-10 each include all of the limitations of claim 1 from which they depend. Thus, Applicant submits that claims 8-10 are also allowable for at least the reasons set forth regarding claim 1.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**Rejection of Claim 18 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In the Action at item 9, claim 18 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Agasse in view of Harms et al. and Bedard, and further in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter referred to as APA).

Claims 18 is submitted to be patentable over the cited art of Agasse in view of Harms et al. and Bedard for the same reasons set forth above with regard to claim 17.

It is submitted that the additional of Applicant's APA does not overcome the deficiencies of Agasse in view of Harms et al. and Bedard because Applicant's APA does not disclose or suggest the feature of simultaneous removal of bookmarks as recited in claim 1. This is because, in particular, Applicant's APA is silent regarding anything related to bookmarks and, furthermore and more particularly, to simultaneous removal of bookmarks.

Claim 18 includes all of the limitations of claim 17 from which it depends. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 18 is also allowable for at least the reasons set forth regarding claim 17.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Appln. No.: 09/740,364  
Amendment Dated April 25, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of February 23, 2005

MATP-600US


### New Claim 20

New claim 20 recites the feature of "the channel matrix is configured to be displayed with only channels that are bookmarked," and is submitted to be allowable for at least this recitation.

### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments, new claim and remarks, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objections to specification, the rejection of claims 1 and 3-19 and enter and consider new claim 20.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Kenneth N. Nigon, Reg. No. 31,549  
Attorney for Applicant

KNN/tmb


Dated: April 25, 2005

P.O. Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482  
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. 18-0350 of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (1-703-872-9306) on:

April 25, 2005

  
Tonya M. Berger